

Resummation Methods for Analyzing Time Series

S. Gluzman¹ and V. I. Yukalov^{2*}

¹*International Center of Condensed Matter Physics
University of Brasilia, CP 04513, Brasilia, DF 70919-970, Brazil*
and

²*Bogolubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna 141980, Russia*

An approach is suggested for analyzing time series by means of resummation techniques of theoretical physics. A particular form of such an analysis, based on the algebraic self-similar renormalization, is developed and illustrated by several examples from the stock market time series.

01.75+m, 02.30.Lt, 02.30.Mv, 05.40+j

I. SELF-SIMILAR RENORMALIZATION

Many data in different sciences are presented in the form of time series. The problem of analyzing the latter consists in understanding the dynamics of motion from one temporal point to another in the past and, hopefully, in forecasting the data for at least some near future. The standard approach to time-series analysis is to try to guess what stochastic dynamical system is behind the data, that is, to attempt to model the events producing the considered data by stochastic differential or finite-difference equations [1,2]. Such an approach has been proved to be reasonable when applied to a system close to a stationary state, but sudden changes in the behavior of the dynamical system generating the time series cannot be accurately grasped.

In this communication we advance a novel approach to analyzing time series, based on resummation techniques that are used in theoretical physics. As examples for illustration, we opt for time series generated by economic systems, including sharp changes in their behavior. Let us note that different physical analogies and techniques are now often used for describing economic phenomena [3-8].

As a starting point, we present a discrete set of data, available from the system past, in the form of a polynomial (i.e. as a formal power series), which is a direct analog of a perturbative expansion valid as time $t \rightarrow 0$. The rest consists in the application of one or another resummation technique to the asymptotic expansion where the role of a coupling constant is played by time. If only a few points from the system history are known, the degree of the asymptotic expansion will be low, and the most popular Pade' summation [9] is very difficult, if possible, to apply. However, there is an approach called the self-similar approximation theory [10-17] which successfully works even for a small number of asymptotic terms. Here we shall use a variant of this approach, the algebraic self-similar renormalization [15-17]. We consider below several examples taken from the history of real stock markets using only a few, up to six, points from the history in order to calculate the following values of the share prices.

First, let us give the general scheme of the method we suggest. Assume that the values of the sought function, $f(t)$, are known for n equidistant successive moments of time, $t = k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, so that

$$f(0) = a_0, \quad f(1) = a_1, \quad \dots, \quad f(n-1) = a_{n-1}. \quad (1)$$

Let us be interested in the value of the function $f(n)$ in the following n -th moment of time. To proceed further, it is important to find a compact representation of the set of the data (1) in the form of an explicit function. To this end, we can always use a formal Taylor series of the sought function, $f(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A_k t^k$. Since only a finite set of values

*the author to whom the correspondence to be addressed

(1) is available, one can reconstruct only a finite set of coefficients, $A_k = A_k(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, from condition (1). Thus, we obtain an approximate expansion

$$f(t) \simeq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} A_k(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) t^k. \quad (2)$$

Let us stress that expansion (2) has no direct sense if continued straightforwardly to the region of finite arbitrary t . The problem of reconstructing the value of a function in some distant moment of time from the knowledge of a finite set of its values in preceding time moments becomes now equivalent to the reconstruction of the function for the finite value of its argument, $t = n$, from the knowledge of its asymptotic expansion as $t \rightarrow 0$. In theoretical physics, such a problem is called renormalization or resummation problem [9,18]. Thus, the problem of forecasting the future values from the set of historical data given in the form of time series becomes equivalent to the renormalization (resummation) of asymptotic series. An analytical tool for the solution of this problem, called the algebraic self-similar renormalization, has been recently developed [15-17]. We describe here only its principal points that are important within the context of this letter. The polynomial representation (2) gives for the sought function $f(t)$ the following n approximations $p_i(t)$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$,

$$p_0(t) = A_0 \equiv a_0, \quad p_1(t) = p_0(t) + A_1 t, \dots, \quad p_{n-1}(t) = p_{n-2}(t) + A_{n-1} t^{n-1}. \quad (3)$$

The algebraic self-similar renormalization starts from applying to the approximations (3) an algebraic transformation, defining $P_i(t, s) = t^s p_i(t)$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, with $s \geq 0$. This transformation raises the powers of series (3), and allows us to take effectively into consideration more points from the system history. We use in what follows the strongest form of such a transformation when $s \rightarrow \infty$, which results in a nice exponential representation for the sought function. The sequence of so transformed approximations $P_i(t, s)$ is considered as a dynamical system in discrete time $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$. In order to describe the system evolution with time, we introduce, according to Refs. [10-14], a new variable φ and define the so-called expansion function $t(\varphi, s)$ from the equation $P_0(t, s) = a_0 t^s = \varphi$, which results in $t(\varphi, s) = (\varphi/a_0)^{1/s}$. Then we construct an approximation cascade [10-14] whose trajectory points are given by the expressions $y_i(\varphi, s) \equiv P_i(t(\varphi, s), s)$. Embedding this cascade into an approximation flow, one can write the evolution equation in the form of the functional self-similarity relation $y_{i+p}(\varphi, s) = y_i(y_p(\varphi, s), s)$. At this stage, we can check the effectiveness of the algebraic transformation by calculating the local multipliers,

$$m_i(t, s) \equiv \left[\frac{\partial y_i(\varphi, s)}{\partial \varphi} \right]_{\varphi=P_0(t, s)}, \quad (4)$$

as $s \rightarrow \infty$. For calculations we use the integral form of the self-similarity relation,

$$\int_{P_{i-1}}^{P_i^*} \frac{d\varphi}{v_i(\varphi, s)} = \tau,$$

where the cascade velocity $v_i(\varphi, s) = y_i(\varphi, s) - y_{i-1}(\varphi, s)$ and τ is the minimal number of steps of the procedure needed to reach the fixed point $P_i^*(t, s)$ of the approximation cascade. It is possible to find $P_i^*(t, s)$ explicitly and to perform an inverse algebraic transform after which the limit $s \rightarrow \infty$ is to be taken. The first step of the self-similar renormalization is completed. Then the procedure can be repeated as many times as it is necessary to renormalize all polynomials. This is the main idea of the self-similar bootstrap [17]. Accomplishing this program, we come to the following sequence of the self-similar exponential approximants

$$f_j^*(t, \tau) = A_0 \exp \left(\frac{A_1}{A_0} t \exp \left(\frac{A_2}{A_1} t \dots \exp \left(\frac{A_j}{A_{j-1}} \tau t \right) \dots \right) \right), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1. \quad (5)$$

In order to check whether this sequence converges, we have to analyze the corresponding mapping multipliers. From the equation $f_1^*(t, 1) = \varphi$, we find $t(\varphi) = (A_0/A_1) \ln(\varphi/A_0)$. Then we construct an approximation cascade, as is described above, getting $z_j(\varphi, \tau) \equiv f_j^*(t(\varphi), \tau)$, and define

$$M_j(t, \tau) \equiv \left[\frac{\partial z_j(\varphi, \tau)}{\partial \varphi} \right]_{\varphi=f_1^*(t, 1)}. \quad (6)$$

Selecting from the sequence of f_j^* two successive terms with smallest $M_j(t) \equiv M_j(t, 1)$, as a rule the two last terms of the sequence, we can finally determine τ from the minimal velocity condition written as the minimal difference condition

$$\min_{\tau} |f_j^*(t, \tau) - f_{j-1}^*(t, \tau)|, \quad (7)$$

whose solution $\tau = \tau(t)$ allows us to write the final self-similar exponential approximation for the sought function

$$f_j^*(t) = f_j^*(t, \tau(t)). \quad (8)$$

The approximants $f_{n-2}^*(n, 1)$ and $f_{n-1}^*(n, 1)$ usually frame the optimal value $f_{n-1}^*(n)$. One should analyze, following the procedure described above, a set of self-similar approximations for different number of points from the history, i.e., one has to calculate several possible $f_j^*(t)$, $j = 2, 3, \dots, n-1$, and to choose among them that which corresponds to the smallest mapping multiplier calculated at the fixed point. The value of the multiplier at the fixed point can be defined as

$$M_j^*(t) \equiv \frac{M_j(t, \tau(t)) + M_{j-1}(t, \tau(t))}{2}. \quad (9)$$

Now we pass to the illustration of the method by examples from the history of various stock markets. We concentrate on different stock market crises, when the prices changed sharply during the period of time comparable to the resolution of time series. The data, unless stated otherwise, are taken from the books of International Financial Statistics issued by the International Monetary Fund.

II. MECHANISM OF CRASH

Consider the behavior of the Dow Jones index in the vicinity of the crisis of October 27, 1997. We intend to give an illustration of the self-similar renormalization scheme presented above and also to make some general remarks concerning the mechanism of crash. We are going to make a forecast for the Dow Jones index for *October 25, 1997* based on different number of points from the system history.

Three point forecast. The following values are available in the period of time from *September 13, 1997* till *October 11, 1997* taken with the two-week resolution (data are taken from the Yahoo Finance chart):

$$a_0 = 7720 \text{ (Sept. 13)}, \quad a_1 = 7920, \quad a_3 = 8000 \text{ (Oct. 11)}.$$

The coefficients of the polynomial (2) are $A_1 = 260$ and $A_2 = -60$. We find the exponential approximants $f_1^*(3, 1) = 8540.8$ and $f_2^*(3, 1) = 8120.4$ and the mapping multipliers $M_1(3) = 1$ and $M_2(3) = 0.146$. From the minimal difference condition $\min_{\tau} |f_2^*(3, \tau) - f_1^*(3, \tau)|$, we obtain $\tau = 0.641428$. Finally, the self-similar exponential approximation is $f_2^*(3) = 8237$ and the modulus of the multiplier (9) is $|M_2^*(3)| = 0.485$.

Four-point forecast. The following values are available in the period of time from *August 30, 1997* till *October 11, 1997* taken with the two week resolution (data are taken from the Yahoo Finance chart):

$$a_0 = 7690 \text{ (Aug. 30)}, \quad a_1 = 7720, \quad a_2 = 7920, \quad a_3 = 8000 \text{ (Oct. 11)}.$$

The coefficients of the polynomial are $A_1 = -151.667$, $A_2 = 230$, and $A_3 = -48.333$. Repeating the same procedure as above, we find the exponential approximants $f_2^*(4, 1) = 7689$ and $f_3^*(4, 1) = 7646$, with the mapping multipliers $M_2(4) = -0.013$ and $M_3(4) = 0.046$. From the minimal difference condition $\min_{\tau} |f_3^*(4, \tau) - f_2^*(4, \tau)|$, we obtain $\tau = 0.6026$. The self-similar exponential approximant becomes $f_3^*(4) = 7674$ and the corresponding multiplier modulus is $|M_3^*(4)| = 0.048$.

Five-point forecast. Consider the historical data for the Dow Jones index in the period of time from *August 16, 1997* to *October 11, 1997*. The following data are available:

$$a_0 = 7780 \text{ (Aug. 16)}, \quad a_1 = 7690, \quad a_2 = 7720, \quad a_3 = 7920, \quad a_4 = 8000 \text{ (Oct. 11)}.$$

From condition (1), the coefficients of the polynomial (2), with $i = 0, 1, \dots, 4$, are

$$A_1 = -48.333, \quad A_2 = -120.833, \quad A_3 = 93.333, \quad A_4 = -14.167.$$

The following three higher-order self-similar exponential approximants, $f_2^*(t, \tau)$, $f_3^*(t, \tau)$, and $f_4^*(t, \tau)$ can be written, so that at $t = 5$ we have $f_2^*(5, 1) = 0$, $f_3^*(5, 1) = 7472$, and $f_4^*(5, 1) = 6113$. The corresponding mapping multipliers, $M_2(5) = 0$, $M_3(5) = 0.319$, and $M_4(5) = 13.569$, signal that the subsequence f_2^* , f_3^* , f_4^* is unstable. But from the minimal difference condition $\min_{\tau} |f_4^*(5, \tau) - f_3^*(5, \tau)|$ we can still locate the fixed point and find $\tau = 0.6232$. The self-similar exponential approximation is $f_4^*(5) = 7069$, with the multiplier modulus $|M_4^*(5)| = 0.163$.

Six-point forecast. Consider the data for the Dow Jones index in the period of time from *August 2, 1997* to *October 11, 1997*:

$$a_0 = 8170 \text{ (Aug. 2)}, \quad a_1 = 7780, \quad a_2 = 7690,$$

$$a_3 = 7720, \quad a_4 = 7920, \quad a_5 = 8000 \text{ (Oct. 11)}.$$

The coefficients of the polynomial are $A_1 = -771.5$, $A_2 = 582.917$, $A_3 = -253.75$, $A_4 = 57.083$, and $A_5 = -4.75$. Following the standard prescriptions, we can find the exponential approximants $f_4^*(6, 1) = 7720$ and $f_5^*(6, 1) = 7138$ and the mapping multipliers $M_4(6) = -0.308$ and $M_5(6) = 0.198$. From the minimal difference condition $\tau = \exp(6A_5\tau/A_4)$ we obtain $\tau = 0.7037$. For the self-similar exponential approximation we get $f_5^*(6) = 7328$, with the multiplier modulus $|M_5^*(6)| = 0.087$.

All forecasts, except the three-point one, predict a decrease of the Dow Jones index. Normally, in the absence of a dramatic event which can alter drastically the market activity, one should expect that the most stable trajectory is to be realized. Expecting the sequence of the multipliers $\{M_j^*\}$, $j = 2, 3, \dots, 5$, we notice that the four-point forecast $f_3^*(4) = 7674$ is optimal from the viewpoint of stability, that is, it corresponds to the minimal mapping multiplier, and, thus, this four-point prediction is to be chosen as the final estimate. The Dow Jones index on *October 25, 1997* was 7715. The percentage error of our forecast equals -0.531% . An upward development, predicted by the three-point forecast, appears to be less stable than the decaying trajectories. The level achieved by the market after the bubble burst corresponds rather to a correction than to a crash.

When the normal evolution is disrupted by some unexpected *negative* dramatic events, such as the crisis in Hong Kong, which disturbs the self-similar dynamics, then it may happen that the market temporarily selects not the most stable trajectory. In its search for a solution, the market may leave for a while the most stable trajectory and jump to a less stable one. Then, it can bounce back to the most stable trajectory or it can fall for a while on the least stable trajectory corresponding, in this case, to the five-point forecast. During a short period of time, less than the time-series resolution, one can observe a rapid succession of all possible trajectories. After the source of the self-similarity violation is lifted, one may expect that the market will return to the most stable trajectory. The motion to the least stable trajectory is the most dramatic moment, as is seen from the analysis of the five-point forecast. Since both starting polynomial coefficients are negative and $|A_2| \gg |A_1|$, an extremely strong tendency to decay, a sort of panic, appears resulting in $f_2^*(5, 1) = 0$; however the situation is remedied due to the higher-order coefficient $A_3 > 0$, which reflects still existing moderately optimistic views; though such an optimism remains limited by pessimistic views represented by the negative A_4 . The finite value given by $f_4^*(5) = 7069$ is quite low because of such a combination of tendencies. We would like to stress that in the case of the five-point forecast the fixed point determined by the locally unstable sequence f_3^* , f_4^* lies very close to the boundary separating stable from unstable trajectories. This is why the short-term market changes can be vary rapid, first, to the level determined by $f_5^*(6) = 7328$, and then to the level $f_3^*(4) = 7674$. We conclude that the following reasons caused the October 1997 fluctuations: (1) the burst of the upward bubble accompanied by the appearance of several stable decaying trajectories; (2) the location of one of these trajectories, corresponding to strong decay, at the boundary between stable and unstable trajectories; (3) the Hong Kong crash that pushed the market from the most stable trajectory with moderate corrections right to this unstable trajectory, although shortly after this crisis the market promptly bounced back to the nearby stable trajectories.

III. MARKET CRISES

We shall consider several examples of crises happened in different stock markets. In all the cases we have performed the same steps as in Sections I and II, but only the optimal forecasts are presented below. It turns out that different crises require for their description different number of historical points. Let us start from the crises which can be described knowing only **three points** from the system history:

(i) Consider the dynamics of the average index of the French industrial share prices from 1986 to 1988, with one year time resolution, and make a forecast for 1989. The following historical data are available (the price in 1985 is taken for 100, $1985 = 100$) :

$$a_0 = 153.3 \text{ (1986)}, \quad a_1 = 177.6 \text{ (1987)}, \quad a_2 = 162.1 \text{ (1988)}.$$

From condition (1), the coefficients of polynomial (2), with $i = 0, 1, 2$, can be found giving $A_1 = 44.2$ and $A_2 = -19.9$. The following exponential approximants (5) can be readily obtained:

$$f_1^*(t, \tau) = a_0 \exp\left(\frac{A_1}{a_0}\tau t\right), \quad f_2^*(t, \tau) = a_0 \exp\left(\frac{A_1}{a_0}t \exp\left(\frac{A_2}{A_1}\tau t\right)\right),$$

from where, at $t = 3$ and $\tau = 1$, we have $f_1^*(3, 1) = 364.078$ and $f_2^*(3, 1) = 191.8$. The mapping multipliers can be calculated using formula (6), which yields $M_1(3) \equiv 1$ and $M_2(3) = -0.048$, so that the sequence f_1^* , f_2^* is locally stable [14]. From the minimal difference condition $\min_{\tau} |f_2^*(3, \tau) - f_1^*(3, \tau)|$, which reads as

$$\tau = \exp\left(\frac{3A_2}{A_1}\tau\right),$$

we find $\tau = 0.505$. Finally, the self-similar exponential approximation for the sought share price index is $f_2^*(3) = 237.34$. The actual value of the index in 1989 was 234.9. The percentage error of our forecast is 1.039%.

(ii) In 1990 – 1992, the average index of the Denmark shipping share prices had the following values (1990 = 100):

$$a_0 = 100 \text{ (1990)}, \quad a_1 = 100 \text{ (1991)}, \quad a_2 = 92 \text{ (1992)}.$$

Let us look for the price in 1993. This case can be considered by analogy with the previous one. The polynomial coefficients can be readily found being $A_1 = 4$ and $A_2 = -4$. For the considered index we have $f_1^*(3, 1) = 112.75$ and $f_2^*(3, 1) = 100.60$. The mapping multiplier $M_2(3) = -0.089$, hence the sequence of exponential approximants locally converges. From the minimal difference condition, we find $\tau = 0.35$. Thus, the self-similar exponential approximation is $f_2^*(3) = 104.289$. The actual index in 1993 was 105, so the error is -0.677% .

(iii) Consider the average index of the Swiss industrial share prices from 1993 to 1995 (1990 = 100):

$$a_0 = 137.4 \text{ (93)}, \quad a_1 = 159.2 \text{ (94)}, \quad a_2 = 166 \text{ (95)}.$$

The corresponding polynomial coefficients are $A_1 = 29.3$ and $A_2 = -7.5$. Let us make a forecast for 1996. Repeating literally the same steps as above, we can easily calculate the exponential approximants $f_1^*(3, 1) = 260.508$, $f_2^*(3, 1) = 184.883$, and the mapping multiplier $M_2(3) = 0.076$. Then from the minimal difference condition we find $\tau = 0.621$. So, the self-similar exponential approximation is $f_2^*(3) = 204.394$. The price in 1996 was 206.3, which shows that the percentage error of our forecast equals -0.924% .

We continue with the crises which can be described using **four-points** from the history:

(i) Consider the dynamics of the average index of the French industrial share prices in 1970 – 1973, with one year resolution (1970 = 100):

$$a_0 = 100 \text{ (70)}, \quad a_1 = 95.8 \text{ (71)}, \quad a_2 = 107.4 \text{ (72)}, \quad a_3 = 129.7 \text{ (73)}.$$

Let us make a forecast for 1974. The polynomial coefficients found from condition (2) are $A_1 = -13.8$, $A_2 = 10.45$ and $A_3 = -0.85$. The exponential approximants (5) are

$$f_1^*(t, \tau) = a_0 \exp\left(\frac{A_1}{a_0}\tau t\right),$$

$$f_2^*(t, \tau) = a_0 \exp\left(\frac{A_1}{a_0}t \exp\left(\frac{A_2}{A_1}\tau t\right)\right),$$

$$f_3^*(t, \tau) = a_0 \exp\left(\frac{A_1}{a_0}t \exp\left(\frac{A_2}{A_1}t \exp\left(\frac{A_3}{A_2}\tau t\right)\right)\right).$$

Therefore, at $t = 4$, we have $f_1^*(4, 1) = 57.58$, $f_2^*(4, 1) = 97.366$, and $f_3^*(4, 1) = 93.996$. The corresponding multipliers are $M_1(4) \equiv 1$, $M_2(4) = -0.166$, and $M_3(4) = -0.087$. From the minimal difference condition $\min_{\tau} |f_3^*(4, \tau) - f_2^*(4, \tau)|$, which reads

$$\tau = \exp\left(\frac{4A_3}{A_2}\tau\right),$$

we find $\tau = 0.7767$. Thus, the self-similar exponential approximation is $f_3^*(4) = 94.885$. Our estimate agrees well with the actual price equal to 96.6 in 1973. The percentage error is -1.775% .

(ii) In 1985 – 1988, the average index of the Netherlands general share prices had the following values:

$$a_0 = 100 \text{ (85)}, \quad a_1 = 128.7 \text{ (86)}, \quad a_2 = 129.2 \text{ (87)}, \quad a_3 = 119.7 \text{ (88)}.$$

We are going to forecast the price for 1989. The polynomial coefficients are $A_1 = 48.867$, $A_2 = -23.2$, and $A_3 = 3.033$. The local multiplier $m_1(t, s) = 1 + A_1(1 + s)t/A_0s$, as $s \rightarrow \infty$ and $t = 4$, takes the value $m_1(4, \infty) = 1 + 4A_1/A_0 = 2.995$, hence the quality of the sequence of P_i , $i = 0, 1, \dots, 3$, is not good. In this case, we can consider another sequence of approximations, which does not include the constant term. The expansion function now is determined from the equation $A_1 t^{1+s} = \varphi$ giving $t(\varphi, s) = (\varphi/A_1)^{1/(1+s)}$. The corresponding local multiplier, defined by the formula analogous to (4), that is $m_{3,1}(t, s) = 1 + A_2(2 + s)t/A_1(1 + s)$, as $s \rightarrow \infty$, $t = 4$, equals $-0.899 < 1$. Thence the following self-similar exponential approximants can be obtained (see Ref. [17] for more details):

$$f_3^*(t, \tau) = a_0 + A_1 t \exp\left(\frac{A_2}{A_1} \tau t\right),$$

$$f_4^*(t, \tau) = a_0 + A_1 t \exp\left(\frac{A_2}{A_1} t \exp\left(\frac{A_3}{A_2} \tau t\right)\right).$$

This leads to the estimates $f_3^*(4, 1) = 129.264$ and $f_4^*(4, 1) = 163.417$. The mapping multiplier $M_3(4)$, calculated from the formula analogous to (6), equals 0.613, which tells that the sequence f_3^* , f_4^* is stable. From the minimal difference condition $\min_\tau |f_4^*(4, \tau) - f_3^*(4, \tau)|$ we find $\tau = 0.6952$, which results in the self-similar exponential approximation $f_4^*(4) = 152.206$. Our forecast agrees well with the index in 1989, equal to 151.4, thus the error being 0.532%.

(iii) Consider the data for the average index of the Mexican share prices in 1991 – 1994 (1990 = 100) :

$$a_0 = 190.1 \text{ (91)}, \quad a_1 = 291.3 \text{ (92)}, \quad a_2 = 325.6 \text{ (93)}, \quad a_3 = 442.1 \text{ (94)}.$$

The polynomial coefficients are $A_1 = 184.35$, $A_2 = -108$, and $A_3 = 24.85$. Let us make a forecast for 1995. Since $m_1(4, \infty) = 4.879$ and $m_{3,1}(4, \infty) = -1.343$, we will proceed in a close analogy to the case (ii). Repeating the same steps as above, we can readily calculate the exponential approximants $f_3^*(4, 1) = 260.893$ and $f_4^*(4, 1) = 480.018$ and the mapping multiplier $M_3(4) = 0.13$. Then from the minimal difference condition, we get $\tau = 0.584$. The self-similar exponential approximation is $f_4^*(4) = 377.695$. The index in 1995 was 389.3; so the percentage error of our forecast equals -2.981% .

Five-point crises: (i) Consider the historical data for the average index of the German industrial share prices in 1957 – 1961, with one year resolution, and let us make a forecast for 1962. The following data are available (1958 = 100) :

$$a_0 = 78 \text{ (57)}, \quad a_1 = 100 \text{ (58)}, \quad a_2 = 171 \text{ (59)}, \quad a_3 = 272 \text{ (1960)}, \quad a_4 = 282 \text{ (61)}.$$

From condition (1), the coefficients of polynomial (2), with $i = 0, 1, \dots, 4$, are $A_1 = 16.667$, $A_2 = -12.75$, $A_3 = 22.333$, and $A_4 = -4.25$. The higher-order self-similar exponential approximants are

$$f_3^*(t, \tau) = a_0 \exp\left(\frac{A_1}{a_0} t \exp\left(\frac{A_2}{A_1} t \exp\left(\frac{A_3}{A_2} \tau t\right)\right)\right),$$

$$f_4^*(t, \tau) = a_0 \exp\left(\frac{A_1}{a_0} t \exp\left(\frac{A_2}{A_1} t \exp\left(\frac{A_3}{A_2} t \exp\left(\frac{A_4}{A_3} \tau t\right)\right)\right)\right).$$

At $t = 5$, we get $f_3^*(5, 1) = 226.885$ and $f_4^*(5, 1) = 199.314$. The corresponding mapping multipliers, $M_3(5) = 1.003$ and $M_4(5) = 0.687$, signal that the subsequence f_3^* , f_4^* is stable. From the minimal difference condition $\min_\tau |f_4^*(5, \tau) - f_3^*(5, \tau)|$ we have

$$\tau = \exp\left(\frac{5A_4}{A_3} \tau\right).$$

The latter equation gives $\tau = 0.577$. The self-similar exponential approximation $f_4^*(5) = 221.268$ agrees well with the actual value of the index in 1962 equal to 221. The percentage error is 0.121%.

(ii) The average index of the Swedish share prices in the period of time from May 1987 to September 1987 had the following values (1980 = 100):

$$a_0 = 726, \quad a_1 = 740, \quad a_2 = 801, \quad a_3 = 825, \quad a_4 = 877.$$

What was the value of the index in October 1987? This case can be considered by analogy with (i). The polynomial coefficients are $A_1 = -74.75$, $A_2 = 133.792$, $A_3 = -51.25$, and $A_4 = 6.208$. The estimates for the index are

$f_3^*(5, 1) = 632.564$ and $f_4^*(5, 1) = 710.11$. The multipliers are $M_3(5) = 0.861$ and $M_4(5) = -0.06$, hence we conclude that the sequence of the exponential approximants locally converges. From the minimal difference condition, we get $\tau = 0.6675$. The self-similar exponential approximation $f_4^*(5) = 695.732$. The actual value of the index in *October 1987* was 697. So that the error of our prediction is -0.182% .

(iii) Consider the historical data for the average index of the Israel industrial share prices in 1989 – 1993 (1990 = 100):

$$a_0 = 87 \text{ (89)}, \quad a_1 = 100 \text{ (90)}, \quad a_2 = 155 \text{ (91)}, \quad a_3 = 297 \text{ (92)}, \quad a_4 = 418 \text{ (93)}.$$

The polynomial coefficients are $A_1 = 45.25$, $A_2 = -71.625$, $A_3 = 45.75$, and $A_4 = -6.375$. Let us make a forecast for the year 1994. Repeating the same steps as above, we find the approximants $f_3^*(5, 1) = 569.963$ and $f_4^*(5, 1) = 146.153$ and the mapping multipliers $M_3(5) = 0.608$ and $M_4(5) = 0.004$. Then from the minimal difference condition, we get $\tau = 0.64$. The self-similar exponential approximation is $f_4^*(5) = 221.18$. The actual value of the index in 1994 was 257. The percentage error of our forecast equals -13.938% .

Six-point crises: (i) Consider the historical data for the Standard Statistics index of the New York Stock Exchange prices in the period from *April 1929* till *September 1929*, with one month resolution, and let us make a forecast for *October 1929*. The following historical data are available (taken from the League of Nations Statistical Yearbook; 1926 = 100) :

$$a_0 = 193 \text{ (Apr. 1929)}, \quad a_1 = 193, \quad a_2 = 191, \quad a_3 = 203, \quad a_4 = 210, \quad a_5 = 216 \text{ (Sept. 1929)}.$$

From condition (1), the polynomial coefficients, for $i = 0, 1, \dots, 5$, are

$$A_1 = 26.683, \quad A_2 = -49.208, \quad A_3 = 28.333, \quad A_4 = -6.292, \quad A_5 = 0.483.$$

Two higher-order self-similar exponential approximants write

$$f_4^*(t, \tau) = a_0 \exp \left(\frac{A_1}{a_0} t \exp \left(\frac{A_2}{A_1} t \exp \left(\frac{A_3}{A_2} t \exp \left(\frac{A_4}{A_3} \tau t \right) \right) \right) \right),$$

$$f_5^*(t, \tau) = a_0 \exp \left(\frac{A_1}{a_0} t \exp \left(\frac{A_2}{A_1} t \exp \left(\frac{A_3}{A_2} t \exp \left(\frac{A_4}{A_3} t \exp \left(\frac{A_5}{A_4} \tau t \right) \right) \right) \right) \right).$$

The estimates for the index at $t = 6$ are $f_4^*(6, 1) = 194.884$ and $f_5^*(6, 1) = 206.722$. The corresponding mapping multipliers, $M_4(6) = -0.025$ and $M_5(6) = 0.021$, signal that the subsequence f_4^* , f_5^* is stable. From the minimal difference condition $\min_{\tau} |f_5^*(6, \tau) - f_4^*(6, \tau)|$ one has

$$\tau = \exp \left(\frac{6A_5}{A_4} \tau \right).$$

This gives $\tau = 0.7182$. The self-similar exponential approximation is $f_5^*(6) = 201.692$. The actual value of the index in *October 1929* was 194. The percentage error equals 3.965% . It is worth noting that our lower bound estimate, $f_4^*(6, 1)$, practically coincides with the real value.

(ii) Consider the behavior of the industrial share prices in the New York Stock Exchange characterized by the average Standard&Poor index, in the period of time from the *second quarter of 1986* to the *third quarter of 1987* (1980=100):

$$a_0 = 199.4 \text{ (II, 86)}, \quad a_1 = 198.2, \quad a_2 = 201.3, \quad a_3 = 235.1, \quad a_4 = 253, \quad a_5 = 277.5 \text{ (III, 87)}.$$

And let us make a forecast for the *fourth quarter of 1987*. This case can be considered by analogy with (i). The coefficients of the polynomial are

$$A_1 = 52.12, \quad A_2 = -103.717, \quad A_3 = 64.096, \quad A_4 = -14.883, \quad A_5 = 1.184.$$

For the index we obtain the values $f_4^*(6, 1) = 202.109$ and $f_5^*(6, 1) = 226.696$. The mapping multipliers are $M_4(6) = -0.01$ and $M_5(6) = 0.012$, so we conclude that the sequence of approximants locally converges. From the minimal difference condition, we find $\tau = 0.7119$. The self-similar exponential approximation becomes $f_5^*(6) = 215.293$. The actual value of the index in the fourth quarter of 1987 was 218.3. The forecast error is 1.377% .

(iii) Consider the behavior of the Standard&Poor index in the period of time from *February 1990* to *July 1990* (1985 = 100),

$$a_0 = 183.4 \text{ (Feb. 90)}, a_1 = 188.5, a_2 = 189.2, a_3 = 196.4, a_4 = 202.8, a_5 = 204.9 \text{ (Jul. 90)}.$$

Let us make a forecast for *August 1990*, the time of the Persian Gulf crisis. The coefficients of the polynomial can be restored giving

$$A_1 = 19.883, A_2 = -25.158, A_3 = 12.783, A_4 = -2.592, A_5 = 0.183.$$

Repeating the same procedure as above, we find the exponential approximants $f_4^*(6,1) = 188.986$ and $f_5^*(6,1) = 201.789$ and the mapping multipliers $M_4(6) = -0.066$ and $M_5(6) = 0.043$. From the minimal difference condition, we obtain $\tau = 0.7327$. The self-similar exponential approximation is $f_5^*(6) = 197.476$. The actual value of the index in *August 1990* was 188.1. The percentage error of our forecast equals 4.985%, and the lower bound given by $f_4^*(6,1)$ practically coincides with the actual value.

IV. ATTEMPT OF PREDICTION

Finally, consider the behavior of the Standard&Poor, Dow Jones, and NYSE Composite indices in the period of time from *April 30, 1997* to *September 30, 1997*, and let us make a forecast for *October 31, 1997*.

For the **NYSE Composite** index we have (from the NYSE Historical Statistics Archive in Internet):

$$a_0 = 416.94 \text{ (Apr. 30)}, a_1 = 441.78, a_2 = 462.44,$$

$$a_3 = 494.5, a_4 = 470.48, a_5 = 497.23 \text{ (Sept. 30)}.$$

The coefficients of the polynomial are

$$A_1 = 104.366, A_2 = -155.195, A_3 = 98.434, A_4 = -24.91, A_5 = 2.145.$$

Repeating the same procedure as above, we find the exponential approximants $f_4^*(6,1) = 430.124$ and $f_5^*(6,1) = 520.109$ and the mapping multipliers $M_4(6) = -0.022$ and $M_5(6) = 0.03$. From the minimal difference condition we obtain $\tau = 0.6974$. The self-similar exponential approximation is $f_5^*(6) = 478.855$.

For the **Standard&Poor** index (data are taken from the DBC Online chart) we have

$$a_0 = 783 \text{ (Apr. 30)}, a_1 = 845, a_2 = 888, a_3 = 948, a_4 = 900, a_5 = 950 \text{ (Sept. 30)}.$$

The coefficients of the polynomial are

$$A_1 = 222.15, A_2 = -306.292, A_3 = 189.75, A_4 = -47.708, A_5 = 4.1.$$

We find the higher exponential approximants $f_4^*(6,1) = 818.966$ and $f_5^*(6,1) = 1030$ and for the mapping multipliers we obtain $M_4(6) = -0.021$ and $M_5(6) = 0.028$. From the minimal difference condition, we find $\tau = 0.6978$. Thus, the self-similar exponential approximation is $f_5^*(6) = 935.082$.

Similarly, for the **Dow Jones** index (data are taken from the DBC Online chart) one has

$$a_0 = 6950 \text{ (Apr. 30)}, a_1 = 7300, a_2 = 7700, a_3 = 8200, a_4 = 7670, a_5 = 8000 \text{ (Sept. 30)},$$

which gives the polynomial coefficients

$$A_1 = 1477, A_2 = -2291, A_3 = 1528, A_4 = -399.167, A_5 = 35.$$

Following the same steps as above, we find the exponential approximants $f_4^*(6,1) = 7108$ and $f_5^*(6,1) = 8400$ and the mapping multipliers $M_4(6) = -0.025$ and $M_5(6) = 0.04$. From the minimal difference condition we obtain $\tau = 0.694088$. The self-similar exponential approximation is $f_5^*(6) = 7788$.

In conclusion, we have shown that resummation techniques of theoretical physics can be successfully employed for analyzing time series. The most convenient such a technique, to our mind, is the algebraic self-similar renormalization [15-17]. We have applied this approach to analyzing time series corresponding to different stock markets. From our point of view, market crises are somewhat similar to critical phenomena in statistical physics. There exists a

temporal region around a crisis, where the behaviour of a market, being intimately connected with its behaviour at times relatively distant from visible anomalies [19], begins exhibiting specific features, like log-periodic oscillations [3-5]. Such a precrisis region around a phase transition, and precrisis effects are similar to precursor phenomena caused by heterophase fluctuations [20]. The point of view that market crises have their origin in the collective behaviour of many interacting agents and that the stock market crises are analogous to critical phenomena has also been promoted by other researchers [5]. The similarity between the crises of stock markets and the critical phenomena of statistical systems makes it possible to apply for their description the same resummation methods, such as the algebraic self-similar renormalization [15-17]. Farther development of this approach will be presented in the following papers.

- [1] G. E. Box and G.M. Jenkins, *Time Series Analysis* (Holden-Day, San Francisco, 1970).
- [2] H. Tong, *Non-Linear Time Series* (Clarendon, Oxford, 1990).
- [3] D. Sornette, A. Johansen, and J. P. Bouchaud, *J. Phys. I France* **6**, 167 (1996).
- [4] J. A. Feigenbaum and P. G. Freund, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **10**, 3737 (1996).
- [5] D. Sornette and A. Johansen, *Physica A* **245**, 411 (1997).
- [6] R. Mantegna and H. E. Stanley, *Nature* **376**, 46 (1995).
- [7] A. Timmermann, *Nature* **376**, 18 (1995).
- [8] S. Ghashghaie, W. Breymann, J. Peinke, P. Talkner and Y. Dodge, *Nature* **381**, 767 (1996).
- [9] G. A. Baker Jr. and P. Graves-Morris, *Padé Approximants* (Cambridge Univ., Cambridge, 1996).
- [10] V. I. Yukalov, *Physica A* **167**, 833 (1990).
- [11] V. I. Yukalov, *J. Math. Phys.* **32**, 1235 (1991).
- [12] V. I. Yukalov, *J. Math. Phys.* **33**, 3994 (1992).
- [13] V. I. Yukalov and E. P. Yukalova, *Physica A* **206**, 553 (1994).
- [14] V. I. Yukalov and E. P. Yukalova, *Physica A* **225**, 336 (1996).
- [15] V. I. Yukalov and S. Gluzman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 333 (1997).
- [16] S. Gluzman and V. I. Yukalov, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, 3983 (1997).
- [17] V. I. Yukalov and S. Gluzman, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, 6552 (1997).
- [18] N. N. Bogolubov and D. V. Shirkov, *Introduction to Theory of Quantized Fields* (Moscow, Nauka, 1984).
- [19] V. Pareto, *Manuel d' Economie Politique* (Giard, Paris, 1927).
- [20] V. I. Yukalov, *Phys. Rep.* **208**, 395 (1991).